Approved for use through 7/31/2006 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction act of 1995, no persona are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. 10/083,203 Application Number TRANSMITTAL **FORM** Filing Date 02/26/2002 First Named Inventor David Chaohua Wu Art Unit 2614 Brian P. Yenke **Examiner Name** (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 13588US01 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (check all that apply) Fee Transmittal Form □ Drawing(s) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Attached Licensing-related Papers Appeal Communication to Board Comments On Statement Of Petition of Appeals and Interferences Reasons For Allowance Petition to Convert to a Appeal Communication to TC Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal **Provisional Application** (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) **Express Abandonment Request** Power of Attorney, Revocation **Proprietary Information** Change of Correspondence Status Letter Information Disclosure Address Statement Return-Receipt Postcard Terminal Disclaimer Certified Copy of Priority Other Enclosure(s) (please Request for Refund Document(s) identify below): CD Number of CD(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Landscape Table on CD Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 Remarks SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT McAndrews Held & Malloy, Ltd. Firm Signature Christopher C. Winslade, Reg. No. 36,308 Printed Name Date January 4, 2005 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 01/04/2005. Christopher C. Winslade Registration No. (Attorney/Agent) 36,308 Name (Print/type) Date 01/05/2005 Signature

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of:	) <u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u>
David Chaohua Wu	)
	) I hereby certify that this correspondence is
Serial No.: 10/083,203	) being deposited with the United States Postal
	) Service as first class mail in an envelope
Filed: February 26, 2002	) addressed to: Mail Stop: Issue Fee,
	) Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
For: Scaling Adjustment To Enhance	) Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 5,
Stereo Separation	) 2005.
Examiner: Brian P. Yenke	} Chile
Group Art Unit: 2614	) Christopher C. Winslade
	) Reg. No. 36,308

## **COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Mail Stop: ISSUE FEE Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper responds to the Examiner's statement of allowable subject matter set forth in the Detailed Action that accompanied allowance of this case.

To the extent that the Examiner's statement suggests or states that certain limitations not found in the prior art are present in each and every claim (whether or not specific language to that effect is actually found in every claim), Applicant notes that the record as a whole, namely, the actual claim language, supplements the Examiner's statement. Moreover, Applicant believes that the Examiner's statement may imply that the dependent claims are also only allowable for the reasons set forth in the Detailed Action. However, the Examiner's reasons do not discuss any of the other elements of the claimed subject matter, in particular those additional elements

recited by dependent claims 2-10 and 12-18, all of which Applicants believe are also not found

in the prior art and render the dependent claims independently allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant interprets the Examiner's statement to be a statement of only one

reason for allowance of the claims, and that other reasons also exist for allowance of the claims

such as, for example, those set forth more completely in the record as a whole. This

interpretation is consistent with MPEP 1302.14, which states that any statement of reasons for

allowance "[i]s not intended to necessarily state all the reasons for allowance or all the details

why claims are allowed and should not be written to specifically or impliedly state all the reasons

for allowance are set forth."

If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's interpretation, the Applicant respectfully

requests that, prior to issuance, the Examiner withdraw the existing statement of reasons for

allowance and simply rely on the record as a whole, or clarify the existing statement of reasons

for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions or if Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner

is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicants' representative at the telephone number

below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2005

Christopher C. Winslade

Reg. No. 36,308

McAndrews, Held & Malloy

500 West Madison Street, Suite 3400

Chicago, Illinois 60661

(312) 775-8000

2